

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/636,044

Applicant(s)

CHIU ET AL

Examiner

NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/02)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/07/2009
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed 06/17/2009.
- B. Claims 1-6,9-10,13-14, 18 and 21-32 remains pending.
-

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/17/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 13-14, 18 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rekimoto, Junichi (US 2001/0044858 A1), herein referred to as "Rekimoto".

As for **independent claims 13**, Rekimoto teaches a method of providing content in a modular presentation system having a plurality of displays, wherein at least two of the plurality of displays are in visual proximity to each other (par.224-225; figure 5; wherein depicted are LCD projectors, computer laptops; digital objects all within a visual proximity of one another), the method comprising: receiving input of a gesture to move first content presented on a first display wherein the first content is all the information displayed on the first display (par. 323-325; 378-379); interpreting a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture (par.92-93); specifying a second display to which the first content is to be moved based on the gesture and the relative position of the plurality of displays; presenting the first content at the second display and a second content at the first display (figure 16-17, par. 329, 334-335).

As for dependent claim 14, Rekimoto teaches the method of claim 5 wherein receiving gesture input includes: receiving input on a touch screen display (par.278; figure 39).

As for dependent claim 18, Rekimoto teaches the method of claim 5, wherein presenting the second content at the first display includes retrieving a second URL and sending the second URL to the first display *and vice versa* (par.261).

As for dependent claim 27, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the content of the second display is automatically propagated on a third display in the plurality of displays (par.224-225 and 287).

As for dependent claim 28, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 21, wherein the third display is in visual proximity to the first and second display (figure 5).

As for dependent claim 29, Rekimoto teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the content of the third display is automatically presented to a display in the plurality of displays (par.287).

As for dependent claim 30, Rekimoto teaches the computer readable medium of claim 28, wherein the instructions further provide that presenting the second content at the third display includes retrieving a second URL and sending the second URL to the third display (par.261).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 21-26 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rekimoto, Junichi (US 2001/0044858 A1), herein referred to as "Rekimoto" in view of Kataoka et al (US PAT. 5,617,117), herein referred to as "Kataoka".

As for **independent claim 1**, Rekimoto teaches a system for proving content in a modular presentation system, comprising: a plurality of displays, wherein each display neighbors at least one other display and at least two of the plurality of displays are in

visual proximity to each other (par.224-225; figure 5; wherein depicted are LCD projectors, computer laptops; digital objects all within a visual proximity of one another); an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a first content from a first display of the plurality of displays to a second display, wherein a second content of the second content of the second display is moved from the second display of the plurality of displays (par.323-325); a processor that interprets a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture, the gesture specifies a second display to which the content is to be moved, based on the gesture and the position of the plurality of displays and that propagates the content of the first display to the second display (par.329, 334-335).

Rekimoto does not specifically teach wherein the gesture is made with a flick which indicates content to be moved and a direction without designating the destination. However in the same field of endeavor ***Kataoka teaches wherein the gesture is made with a flick which indicates content to be moved and a direction without designating the destination*** (col.22,lines 40-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kataoka variant option of moving content into the system of Rekimoto; this is true because Kataoka solves the problem of providing to the user an input device by which the user inputs coordinate information, etc. while observing a cursor displayed, for example, On a display device (col.1, lines 6-8; col.4,lines 19-47). Rekimoto solves the problem of providing to the user an input device to the system by which the user is able to input coordinate information (moving objects, interacting with

onscreen objects, etc...) while observing a cursor displayed on display device (figure 1, 20; par.20, 278 and 294). Thus the combination of methods that solve similar problems presented by Kataoka and Rekimoto is the added variant option of allowing the user to instead or in addition to use the flick gesture of Kataoka opposed to the pick-and-drop technique of Rekimoto.

As for dependent claim 2, wherein each of the plurality of displays is configured to: receive new content identification information; and transmit old content identification information; and present content associated with the new content Identification information (par.261, 326, 334).

As for dependent claim 3, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 2 wherein new content identification information is received from a processor associated with a neighboring display in the reverse propagation direction, the old content identification information is transmitted to a processor associated with a neighboring display in the forward propagation direction, the forward propagation direction derived from the gesture input (par.334-335).

As for dependent claim 4, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 2 wherein receiving new content identification information includes: retrieving new content identification information from a memory stack (353).

As for **independent claims 5**, Rekimoto teaches a method of providing content in a modular presentation system having a plurality of displays, wherein at least two of the plurality of displays are in visual proximity to each other (par.224-225; figure 5; wherein depicted are LCD projectors, computer laptops; digital objects all within a visual proximity of one another), the method comprising: receiving input of a move gesture to move a content including a first content and a second content, wherein the first content presented on a first display of the plurality of displays, wherein the move gesture initiates propagation of content from right to left which indicates content to be moved (par. 278, 294, 323-325 and figure 20; *which depicts movement of content from first display moved to a second display right to left*); interpreting a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture (par.92-93); specifying a second display to which the first content is to be moved based on the gesture and the relative position of the plurality of displays; presenting the first content at the second display and a second content at the first display (figure 16-17, par. 329, 334-335).

Rekimoto does not specifically teach wherein the content is specified as a sequence of content; wherein the move gesture is moved in a direction without designating the destination. However in the same field of endeavor Kataoka teaches *wherein the content is specified as a sequence of content; wherein the move gesture is moved in a direction without designating the destination* (col.22,lines 40-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kataoka variant option of moving content into the system of Rekimoto; this is true because Kataoka solves the problem of providing to the user an

input device by which the user inputs coordinate information, etc. while observing a cursor displayed, for example, On a display device (col.1, lines 6-8; col.4, lines 19-47). Rekimoto solves the problem of providing to the user an input device to the system by which the user is able to input coordinate information (moving objects, interacting with onscreen objects, etc...) while observing a cursor displayed on display device (figure 1, 20; par.20, 278 and 294). Thus the combination of methods that solve similar problems presented by Kataoka and Rekimoto is the added variant option of allowing the user to instead or in addition to use the flick gesture of Kataoka opposed to the pick-and-drop technique of Rekimoto.

As for dependent claims 6, Rekimoto teaches the method of claim 5 wherein receiving gesture input includes: receiving input on a touch screen display (par.278; figure 39).

As for dependent claims 9-10, Rekimoto teaches the method of claim 5, wherein presenting the second content at the first display includes retrieving a second URL and sending the second URL to the first display *and vise versa* (par.261).

As for dependent claims 21, 23, 24, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the content of the second display is automatically propagated on a third display in the plurality of displays (par.224-225 and 287).

As for dependent claims 22, 25, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 21, wherein the third display is in visual proximity to the first and second display (figure 5).

As for dependent claim 26, Rekimoto teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the content of the third display is automatically presented to a display in the plurality of displays (par.287).

As for independent claim 31, Rekimoto teaches a system for providing content in a modular presentation system, comprising: a plurality of displays, wherein each display neighbors at least one other display wherein each display is aware of the neighboring displays, wherein each display remains a discrete separately controlled display (par.224-225; figure 5; wherein depicted are LCD projectors, computer laptops (separately controlled devices); digital objects all within a visual proximity of one another); an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a content from a first display of the plurality of displays (par. 323-325); and a processor, that interprets a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture, that specifies a second display to which the content is to be moved, based on the gesture and the position of the plurality of displays and that propagates the content of the first display to the second display and automatically propagates a second content of the second display to a third display of the plurality of displays (par. 329, 334-335).

Rekimoto does not specifically teach a sequence of content including a first content and a second content; wherein the gesture is a movement from right to left using a finger, wherein the movement from right to left specifies a starting point and a direction. However in the same field of endeavor Kataoka teaches *a sequence of content including a first content and a second content; wherein the gesture is a movement from right to left using a finger, wherein the movement from right to left specifies a starting point and a direction* (col.22, lines 40-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kataoka variant option of moving content into the system of Rekimoto; this is true because Kataoka solves the problem of providing to the user an input device by which the user inputs coordinate information, etc. while observing a cursor displayed, for example, On a display device (col.1, lines 6-8; col.4,lines 19-47). Rekimoto solves the problem of providing to the user an input device to the system by which the user is able to input coordinate information (moving objects, interacting with onscreen objects, etc...) while observing a cursor displayed on display device (figure 1, 20; par.20, 278 and 294). Thus the combination of methods that solve similar problems presented by Kataoka and Rekimoto is the added variant option of allowing the user to instead or in addition to use the flick gesture of Kataoka opposed to the pick-and-drop technique of Rekimoto.

As for claim 32, Rekimoto teaches the system of claim 1 (note the analysis of claim 1 above).

Rekimoto does not specifically teach a sequence of content including the first content and the second content; wherein after the flick gesture the first content is displayed on the second display and the second content is displayed on the first display. However in the field of endeavor ***Kataoka teaches*** a sequence of content including the first content and the second content; wherein after the flick gesture the first content is displayed on the second display and the second content is displayed on the first display (col.22, lines 40-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kataoka variant option of moving content into the system of Rekimoto; this is true because Kataoka solves the problem of providing to the user an input device by which the user inputs coordinate information, etc. while observing a cursor displayed, for example, On a display device (col.1, lines 6-8; col.4,lines 19-47). Rekimoto solves the problem of providing to the user an input device to the system by which the user is able to input coordinate information (moving objects, interacting with onscreen objects, etc...) while observing a cursor displayed on display device (figure 1, 20; par.20, 278 and 294). Thus the combination of methods that solve similar problems presented by Kataoka and Rekimoto is the added variant option of allowing the user to instead or in addition to use the flick gesture of Kataoka opposed to the pick-and-drop technique of Rekimoto.

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6,9-10,13-14, 18 and 21-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
August 19, 2009

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179